MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
8 July 1970

AM
10:00 I. Convene, Room 7000, Interior Department Building

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Anniversary of First Commission Meeting, July 8, 1910

2. Assignment of New Offices, 708 Jackson Place,N.W.

3. Date of Next Meeting: 16 September 1970

4. Approval of the Minutes of 15 April 1970

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Proposed Lighting of Federal Triangle Buildings, Confirmation of Previous Action

b. FBI Building - Material Samples

2. D.C. Government, Department of General Services

a. Shaw Junior High School, 10th and Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. - Proposed Design

b. Gage Eckington Elementary School Replacement, 2nd and V Sts., N.W. - Proposed Design

c. New Elementary School and Community Facility, 8th and Yuma Sts., S.E. - Proposed Design

d. Morgan Elementary School Replacement, 18th and California Sts., N.W. - Proposed Design

3. Department of Interior, National Park Service

a. National Visitors Center, Union Station

b. Proposed site for relocation of statue of José de San Martin

c. Stable in Rock Creek Park - Proposed Design

4. Department of the Navy

Heating Plant Addition, Naval Research Laboratory, near Blue Plains - Proposed Design

5. National Zoological Park

Glockenspiel - Proposed Design

6. D.C. Government - Department of Economic Development

Old Georgetown Act

Appendix 1

IV. LEGISLATION

1. GSA draft bill to establish a Federal Center City Bicentennial Development Corporation, Confirmation of Preliminary Report to Bureau of Budget

2. H.R. 17377 - T authorize erection of a statue of Bernardo de Galvez on Public Grounds in the District of Columbia.

V. INTERVIEWS

11:30 1. D.C. Government, Department of General Services

a. Shaw Junior High School, 10th and Rhode Island Avenuw, N.W. - Proposed Design

b. Gage Eckington Elementary School Replacement, 2nd and V Sts., N.W. - Proposed Design

c. New Elementary School and Community Facility, 8th and Yuma Sts., S.E. - Proposed Design

d. Morgan Elementary School, Replacement, 18th and California Sts., N.W. - Proposed Design

e. Fire Station Engine Co. No. 6 and Rescue Squad No. 1 4th St., & N St., N.W. - Proposed Design

12:30 2. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Visitors Center, Union Station

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
July 8, 1970

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on July 8, 1970. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:25 a.m., with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton, Chairman
Gordon Bunshaft
Kevin Roche
Aline Saarinen
Chloethiel Woodward Smith

Staff: Charles H. Atherton, Sec.
Mary Bean
Jeff Carson
Tom Paine
Daniel D. Reiff

Reporter: Robert Weber

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. The secretary noted that this meeting marked the sixtieth anniversary of the first meeting of the Commission on July 8, 1910.

2. Chairman Walton announced that the Commission had been assigned new offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., and that the next meeting would be held there.

3. The date of the next meeting was tentatively set for September 16, 1970.

4. The minutes of the meeting of April 15, 1970, were approved.

5. The secretary introduced new employees; Mary C. Bean, Architectural Historian, Thomas Paine and Jeffrey R. Carson, both students of architecture. Paine and Carson will be with the staff for the summer only.

III. SUBMISSIONS - REVIEWS

1. National Zoological Park

Glockenspiel - Proposed Design

The glockenspiel took the form of a vessel representing Noah's Ark from which would pass every half hour a procession of animals on an endless belt. This piece of sculpture would be placed in the center of a pool of water, amid fountains and located

directly in front of the bird house.

The sculptor, Mr. Felix de Weldon, wanting to explain his work to the members, was called into the room and questioned about the materials, scale, and use of color. He explained that the animals were to be quarter life-size; that the boat was to be sixteen feet long; and that while the boat could be either metal or fiber glass, the animals had to be light-weight and would be of fiber glass. Although he had not originally intended to use color, the Director of the Zoo had suggested this possibility to him. The sculptor was thanked for his presentation.

Realizing that mainly children would enjoy this kind of sculpture, the members approved it with the provision that color would be used and that the approach would not be too formal in design. Mrs. Smith and Mr. Bunshaft dissented. Exhibit A.

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Proposed Lighting of Federal Triangle Building, Confirming Previous Action.

The proposal for lighting the buildings in the federal triangle had been presented to the members by letter. The scheme employed indirect lighting hidden by architectural elements of the buildings such as the cornices. While not everyone was in agreement, the majority of the members thought the plan was suitable, provided that the level of lighting could be controlled. There was some concern that the lighting would emphasize secondary elements of the buildings.

It was agreed to give the proposal informal approval until the Commission could see the lighting on the buildings. It was also requested that rheostats be installed in order to control the level of lighting.

b. F.B.I. Building - Material Samples

Several samples to be used on different parts of the building were presented. The members objected to the proposed combination of several different textures and patterns, which they felt only tended to reinforce the severity of the design. Although the members did not feel the use of any material would greatly improve the building, they generally agreed that only one texture should be used, a basic precast concrete with a partially exposed aggregate.

The architects of the building were called in and questioned about their choice of materials. The Commission's preference for a single material was discussed with the architect, who agreed to comply with the suggestion. Exhibit B.

4. D.C. Government, Department of General Services

a. Shaw Junior High School, 19th Street and Rhode Island

Avenue, N.W.--Proposed Design

Four schools were submitted for the Commission's review.

The secretary explained that the program of the Shaw School was the result of community action which required that the building be used after school for community functions. The site was complicated by the required decision to keep some existing buildings on the corner of Rhode Island Avenue. It was also noted that the Planning Commission had seen this design and had suggested that it be more of a visual focal point and that it be designed to conserve more land.

The members criticized the variety of conflicting forms such as jagged projections and circular rooms emerging from a central formless space. It was generally agreed that the building was ill-suited to the requirements of the program, that it was poorly adapted to its site and environs, and that the design had not been considered in relationship to the structural system.

b. Gage Eckington Elementary School Replacement, 2nd and V Streets, N.W. - Proposed Design

This school provided classrooms on the first floor and community services on the second floor. The second floor, which could be entered from outside the building by a ramp, included balconies from which parents could observe classroom activities.

The members felt the design had become unnecessarily complicated and therefore inflexible. As the needs of the school change, the building will become less adaptable.

The repetitive use of pitched roofs for various elements of the school impressed the members as an architectural cliche. In the auditorium the ceiling had been pitched upwards from both sides toward a skylight on the center axis of the room. This skylight was criticized as visually disruptive and difficult to construct, and illustrated the architects preoccupation with form rather than with real planning.

Site planning and consideration of the scale of the neighborhood seemed to have been ignored.

c. New Elementary School and Community Facility, 8th and Yuma Streets, S.E. - Proposed Design

This school was planned with its three major functions--the educational center, the physical education facilities, and the community activities--separated from each other so that each wing could be closed off when not in use and so that one type of activity would not disturb others.

While generally approving the design, the members were concerned with the scarcity of windows in the central classroom element. The few windows in the circular educational wing were placed in pie-shaped niches and seemed to provide no view and little relief to the interior spaces.

d. Morgan Elementary School Replacement, 18th and California Streets, N.W. - Proposed Design

The classroom spaces of this school were lighted by a clerestory which is part of the structural system of the roof. The corrugated roof structure spanned a clear, uninterrupted interior space which can be divided by non-structural partitions; the partitions could therefore be moved whenever necessary. The secretary explained that the building would be structurally easy to construct.

The members felt that the site plan was well organized; that the design was simple and flexible; and that the structural system was straightforward and related to the design.

e. Fire Station, Engine Co. No. 6 and Rescue Squad No. 1, 4th St. and N St., N.W. - Proposed Design

The design for the fire station provided for storage of apparatus on the first floor and dormitory space on the second floor. The purpose of the brick bays on the second floor over the entrance to the garage was questioned. It was generally agreed that the design bore little relationship to the program and that many of its details--for example, the windows of the firemen's dormitory rooms--were unnecessarily complicated. Many of the features seemed mannerisms and current cliches

4. Department of Interior, National Park Service

a. National Visitors Center, Union Station

Since the last presentation of the visitors' center, the Highway Department has approved a proposal for the raising of H Street up to the level of the main terminal. It was explained that a large development on the north side of H Street was projected to include an Eisenhower commemorative center and a convention center, but that these plans should not be considered in any way final in the planning of the visitors' center.

The scheme included a large parking garage over the railroad tracks behind Union Station; a concourse below the center section of the parking garage for the sale of tickets and access to buses and trains; loading areas for taxis and buses; and the use of Union Station as a visitors' center.

The objections raised were that there was no model of the area to show the scale of the building; that there seemed to be no justifiable use for Union Station other than as an information center; that the taxi stations were inadequate; that the design was generally unassured and looked like an office building; and that the proposed use of concrete for the lower floors and steel for the upper floors seemed arbitrary. In a discussion of the use of materials and structural elements, the members expressed their belief that the use of either concrete or steel was preferable over the use of both materials. Exhibits C & D.

A copy of the transcript is attached.

b. Proposed Site for Relocation of Statue of Jose de San Martin

The Park Service, hoping to relocate along Virginia Avenue a statue of Jose de San Martin originally located in Judiciary Square and presently in storage, proposed placement of the statue between 20th and 21st Street on Virginia Avenue, as requested by the Argentine government. Two other sites are available on the avenue, and the National Capital Planning Commission is exploring the possibility of grouping statues along the avenue.

The members decided to take no action until the Planning Commission had completed its study.

c. Stable in Rock Creek Park - Proposed Design

The design was received with enthusiasm and was unanimously approved.

5. Department of the Navy

Heating Plant Addition, Naval Research Laboratory, near Blue Plains - Proposed Design

This large addition is to be connected to the older building by an enclosed passageway. Materials and design generally would conform to the existing building. The Commission had no objection and approved it.

6. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

Old Georgetown Act, Appendix 1

The appendix was approved. Exhibit E.

IV. LEGISLATION

1. GSA Draft Bill to Establish a Federal Center City Bicentennial Development Corporation, Confirmation of Preliminary Report to Bureau

The Commission favored the legislation.

2. H.R. 17377 - To Authorize Erection of Statue of Bernardo de

Galrez on Public Grounds in the District of Columbia

The Commission was unanimously opposed to the legislation, reaffirming their view that space for statues in Washington should be reserved for figures of national importance.

V. INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Government, Department of General Services

a. New Elementary School and Community Facility, 8th and Yuma Streets, S.E. - Proposed Design

At this point the secretary called into the room representatives of the school board so that the Commission could discuss with them their judgments of the four schools submitted. Chairman Walton began the discussion by saying that two schools--the one at 8th and Yuma and the Morgan Elementary School--were being approved and that the other two--the Shaw School and the Gage Eckington School--were being disapproved.

Although approving the design, the members questioned why so few windows were employed. The architect explained that window breakage cost the board of education large sums of money each year and that they were trying to minimize these expenses. It was suggested that while the absense of windows on the lower floor was understandable, the windows on the second floor should be more integrated with the design and should provide better views of the surroundings.

b. Gage Eckington Elementary School Replacement, 2nd and V Streets, N.W.--Proposed Design

The members stated their objections to the design on the basis of its inadequate site planning, its complicated structural system, and its arbitrary use of forms. The Commission suggested that the design should be strengthened and simplified. It generally approved the planning of the facilities. The design was returned for further study.

c. Shaw Junior High School, 19th St. and Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.--Proposed Design

In disapproving the design, the Commission explained that the forms were forced and overly complicated, and that the design had nothing to do with the neighborhood. It was pointed out that the jagged projections and the circular elements do not express the functions housed within them. The Commission generally felt that the design was poorly organized and hastily conceived without response to the demands of the program.

d. *Morgan Elementary School Replacement, 18th and California Streets, N.W.--Proposed Design*

The Commission reiterated its reasons for approving the design, stating that it was sensible and a good expression of community participation in the planning.

e. *Fire Station, Engine Co. No. 6 and Rescue Squad No. 1, 4th St. and N St., N.W.--Proposed Design*

In disapproving the design, the Commission asked that the building be redesigned with greater simplicity. They expressed their opinion that the entrances were unnecessarily fussy and that the details were forced and arbitrary. After being questioned about the purpose of the brick bays, the architects explained that they were first developed purely as design, and were then assigned functions. The Commission suggested that the storage space assigned to these bays be re-located within the building.

2. *District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections (Not an Interview)*

The members approved Appendix #1 while waiting for the representatives of the next project to come in. Exhibit E.

3. *Department of Interior, National Park Service, National Visitors Center, Union Station*

Mr. Roche was asked by the Chairman to summarize the following points raised in the earlier discussion: (1) A model of the project showing its relation to Union Station would be helpful. (2) Relation of minibus and taxi circulation to Union Station and use by visitors. (3) Adequacy of taxi ramps on "H" St. for stacking of cabs during periods of peak loads. (4) Conflict in the use of two basic exterior materials (concrete and steel) for the construction of the garage and station facilities.

In reply, the architect said he had assumed overall approval of the mass in relation to such buildings as the Capitol, and that Union Station itself would provide the main focus for visitors, with minibus service provided at the original main entrance. This answered the question of circulation, leaving as the principal issue the aesthetics of the design for the new station and garage. The concensus of the members on this point was clear, that either an all-concrete or an all-steel structure would be more satisfactory than the half-and-half scheme proposed by the architect.

For the record, the members reiterated their approval of the scheme for remodelling Union Station, and the planning elements of the new structure, such as general massing, location of elements, and circulation.

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton, Secretary

28 July 1970

Dear Dr. Reed:

This will confirm the Commission's approval of the glockenspiel that was presented at our meeting on July 8th. The Commission regards this object as play sculpture and as such it should be colorful and lively.

The use of bright colors on the animals is particularly recommended, while the color of the ark should probably be more neutral and subdued.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Dr. Theodore H. Reed
Director
National Zoological Park
Adams Mill Road
Washington, D.C. 20009

Cys to: Mr. DeWeldon
Dr. Pelzman

Exhibit A.

5 November 1970

Dear Mr. Harris:

This will confirm the Commission's action at the July 8th meeting on the exterior material for the FBI Building.

As you will recall, the Commission recommended that there be a single treatment of the exterior concrete with a relatively large exposed aggregate. The color of the concrete would be in the same range as the samples submitted and the texture would be uniform throughout. If there is any question about this action please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. William Harris
Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
Room 5343
18th and F Sts., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405

Exhibit B.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good morning. Good morning. Good afternoon.

Sorry to have kept you waiting.

NVC ARCHITECT: That's quite all right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: ...but we've had so many things.

[Another visitor enters.]

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good morning, good morning, how are you? Welcome.

Come up in any position you want.

[The members of the NVC architectural firm gather around.]

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We've asked Mr. Roche to bring up a few questions. We have been over this.

NVC ARCHITECT: I gather Charlie has briefed you.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, and we've studied it in great detail this morning, so I have asked Mr. Roche to speak for the Commission.

MR. ROCHE: Well, there are a number of reservations and questions we would like to ask. The first part, I will try to enumerate.

The first problem is that the material submitted doesn't really give you a feel of the impact of this and the general environment. There is no small-scale model that

shows the adjoining streets and the highway and the whole building.

I think this is a rather serious problem because you cannot judge from this what the impact of this building would be on the Union Station and the area surrounding it.

It's also rather difficult, I might say, to judge what the impact of the large roof parking area,for instance, from the Capitol from the height. If we had a full-scale model of the environment, I think we could handle that problem better.

NVC ARCHITECT: Would you like me to...

CHAIRMAN WALTON: He'll run through the whole list first, and then you may respond.

MR. ROCHE: The second question has to do with the use of Union Station, which, again, extension of how people would move to the (inaudible) with the widening of the complex and how they would move to it. And it would appear from the present time that the station as such is being bypassed with the bulk of the traffic movement being in the rear--you either go out to the taxi pickup or go to the minibus station, or to the minibus pickup or to the garage; and you have really no reason, as we understand it, you really have no reason to go into the station, unless you were led in there for some

orientation or some orientation purposes.

The third, which is some detailed questions, have to do with the extent of the taxi pickup ground, whether it is adequate in view of some of the streets that we are talking about in here. It does not appear with the experience one has had at airports--it does not appear to be adequate because you could expect a substantial part of the traffic in an area like that.

The next one has to do with the character of the building, and we felt that--if I can just take this down so we can see it. It has somewhat of an indeterminate character. While nothing is essentially wrong with this combination of steel and concrete, I think we further believe that while you need this concrete down below, it seems that both the use of steel and concrete wasn't sufficiently strong to really bring off a piece of architecture, that it should be a much bolder kind of statement.

We wondered in that respect whether the building might not be better if it were all steel and recognizing that you have some standing columns over the tracks or is it possible to make it all concrete, which might be more appropriate in terms of its relationship to Union Station.

I think there was some question about the splitting

up of the form in order to get the air shaft in, mixture again of the concrete shaft with the steel, and some minor questions with respect to the appropriateness of using steel at all, in fact, in this particular location.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Uh-huh.

MRS. SAARINEN: Well, it wasn't sort of making it entirely steel to differentiate it.

MR. ROCHE: Well, we said that we would like to ask that question.

NVC ARCHITECT: Well, if I can remember those in that order...

MR. BUNSHAFT: Other than that, it's all right.

NVC ARCHITECT: Yes, a bit of a problem.

This is really, in our minds, at least, a sort of second in depth presentation; and the last time we were here, we did have a site model. And I am sorry--perhaps, we should have returned it for this meeting, but then brought instead a photo of that model to refresh memories and what not...

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Uh-huh.

NVC ARCHITECT: We also had a large eight-scale model of the interior workings of the Visitors Center or the old landmark building...

CHAIRMAN WALTON : Uh-huh.

NVC ARCHITECT: ...as it stands now. There are points of departure insofar as the handling of people in the building in this regard: The Park Service has retained a team of audio-visual film-makers and graphic people to join with the architects to go through the specific programming that will take place within that building.

So that is sort of a...

MR. BUNSHAFT: Just a moment. We remember all of that.

NVC ARCHITECT: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What we are saying is that even the tourists, as we understand it, will be picked up by the mini-busses at this ramp there.

NVC ARCHITECT: No, sir; no, sir.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Where are they picked up?

NVC ARCHITECT: They are...

M F. BUNSHAFT: Show us where they will be picked up. You don't have to...

NVC ARCHITECT: They will be picked up--the tour bus from the mall will go up and discharge people at this point.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Where will they pick them up?

NVC ARCHITECT: They will pick them up at the front of the building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Oh.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Oh.

NVC ARCHITECT: You see...

MR. BUNSHAFT: Okay. We're all through.

NVC ARCHITECT: The problem is...

MR. BUNSHAFT: All right. All right.

You've answered the question. That's all.

We had the impression that--we were talking about tourists. I think a man going on business doesn't have to go through here.

We had an impression this morning that they would all be picked up where you indicated...

NVC ARCHITECT: No sir; no, sir.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think that answers that, Kevin. Forget that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Very good.

NVC ARCHITECT: And for that reason this space has been considered.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You've covered it. We won't ask it.

NVC ARCHITECT: That, I guess, brings us essentially to the question of the materials more than...

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, yes.

The architecture, okay.

NVC ARCHITECT: We, as you know, there's for the last seven months or so, one of our biggest problems has been with the city and the various agencies to gain inner access to...

MR. BUNSHAFT: We understand that.

NVC ARCHITECT: Once this has been accomplished, we felt that the expression of all the pedestrian and functional aspects of this building should be flow from H Street down through to the plaza; and that expression, including the shafts which collect those people who have parked at various levels, as an expression of their pedestrian way within the building, which is identified by a light shaft and so on and so forth--that that, the expression of that should be all part of the ground architecture, if you will.

And it was with that in mind that we came up to a point, including all the commercial facilities and the office spaces that we had to provide...

MR. BUNSHAFT: Okay, we understand that.

NVC ARCHITECT: ...with a stone.

MR. BUNSHAFT: May I ask a question?

NVC ARCHITECT: Go ahead.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Can you build this garage non-fire-proof on top of all of these public spaces legally?

NVC ARCHITECT: We understand that we can.

We have been in conversation with the D. C. licenses and inspection people on preliminary conversations only. It's a Federal project. They don't have review of it, but we are going to have them review it for us.

We have the egress ways spotted so that we met their requirements for a non-expensive garage.

MR. ROCHE: Non-expensive?

NVC: Non-expensive garage.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You are saying that the roof of these big public spaces will be steel because that's the floor of the garage.

NVC ARCHITECT: The floor of the garage, as our engineers--as we're thinking of it now--I understand it has to go through a lot of engineering study and restudy--is that the--in order to accommodate some of the span we met, we are using two stories of Verendorf (phonetically) truss. That really is our span.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No cars in there?

NVC ARCHITECT: Pardon?

MR. BUNSHAFT: No cars in there?

NVC ARCHITECT: With cars. That's an 84-foot span, and it receives a 64-foot span in the other direction which

may be pre-cast or may be steel-membered. We can't say.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Or it could be concrete.

NVC ARCHITECT: It would have a concrete deck.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But you couldn't have the whole garage built out of concrete--pre-cast T's (phonetically) and pre-cast Verendales (phonetically) and all of that?

NVC ARCHITECT: It could be that way.

We are concerned greatly with the...

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think our problem is with your theory of the concrete business going through with people, fine; but it splits the project in a very unpleasant way.

One thought we had--it's a thought--probably not legal--is that you build this cage up here and these long columns of steel and you weave the spaghetti of that freely. But that would mean that you would have columns that are non-fireproof going up 50, 60, or 70 feet to hit this three levels of garage.

NVC ARCHITECT: We would have to maintain the fire-proofing...

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yeah, well, you can't do it.

NVC ARCHITECT: ...to this level and in the center section, which is the terminal. That's an enclosed space. That is under the jurisdiction of the District licenses and

inspections because...

MR.BUNSHAFT: Another thing is that in this part of the world, for example, if it were concrete, you could have that whole end wall blank because this is a monumental building in front. This looks like an office building and it's not; it's a garage.

I mean, you don't need those windows in this end in that great big thing for ventilation. It could be a blank wall.

NVC ARCHITECT: Well, sir, if we began to close them off...

MR. BUNSHAFT: I just said this facade.

NVC ARCHITECT: If we do close this off, we then get into a different category of parking garage as far as the Code is concerned, and we are in a different ballgame.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No, I'm just--wait a minute. I'm talking about these ends.

NVC ARCHITECT: This one wall?

MR.BUNSHAFT: These ends because this is essentially long that way.

NVC ARCHITECT: I think it's 75 percent open. We must maintain 75 percent.

MR. BUNSHAFT: All we're saying, it's neither fish

nor foul--it ought to be either all steel or all concrete.

MR. ROCHE: It should go to steel. An 80-foot span on this garage, you don't need (a truss)? (inaudible) at all. Thirty-six inches with span would carry the load...

NVC ARCHITECT: Much pre-cast...

MR. ROCHE: No, no, I'm talking about steel--80-foot dimensions. And you could then get a somewhat bolder--you know, if you are going to do it in steel, it ought to look like it has a little bit more guts to it.

NVC ARCHITECT: Can I make a point as to why we selected steel? I think our thoughts on the matter might help give you our feeling.

One, we feel that even though this is a huge building, it should not be coming to the foreground. It should be a background building. It is not a 100-foot garage. It's a very utilitarian structure.

We did not feel, therefore, that we should do anything that would compete in color to conjoin with the view from the plaza of the existing monuments except those levels which were used by the people in the Visitors Center.

Another very minor thing but, nonetheless, I feel rather contributive is the lantern standards that Burnham has designed give you a handsome progression on the in-and-out

cycle of your travel, and they are of the same color. They are brown, almost identical to that steel. That's very small...

MR. BUNSHAFT: If you had a model of this building at that scale--this is a tremendous building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: These are tremendous lanterns.

NVC ARCHITECT: They are.

MR. ROCHE: I have a personal problem with steel. I think it's perfectly fine for a garage and used that way, but it seems to me that, for instance, here, where a span is 80 feet, and you put in, you say, a service elevator--you don't really need it for an 80-foot span for this garage (inaudible)--then you could take all of these things out and you would get a clear line on that...

NVC ARCHITECT: As we have done on the side.

MR.ROCHE: ...which would mean that you would lose some of the office building expression which has been put on the form.

NVC ARCHITECT: We have done that on the other side where it is not Verendorf (phonetically)...

MR. ROCHE: The other problem is also carrying steel on the top. That's the problem.

NVC ARCHITECT: We understand there are some grants --we are very much aware of that problem.

MR. ROCHE: No, we understood this would be all concrete instead of...

MRS. SAARINEN: It's awkward somehow.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's not very--it's really...

NVC ARCHITECT: What we are doing with the steel and its combination with the concrete...

MR. BUNSHAFT: I could give you my version. I don't think there is any feel for the opportunities that you could do with this thing.

I don't think it's got the juice yet. That's what you've been talking about. It hasn't extracted the maximum if it's steel, or it hasn't extracted the maximum if it's concrete. It hasn't gotten the juice out of what you can do.

You mentioned a very narrow truss at this point. My God, if you have one, why don't you count there. It looks like a neat office building.

MR. ROCHE: A regular truss...

NVC ARCHITECT: We had started it with that...

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you have possibilities of getting something really quite juicy.

MR. ROCHE: It's a good opportunity.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we can talk till we're blue in the face, but I think that's all we have to say. You've

got to do some more sweating.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That's probably the essence.

NVC ARCHITECT: Can I ask this question: On this project, being as complicated as it is--I think there are something like 16 agencies involved--

MR. BUNSHAFT: Only one as far as we are concerned.

NVC ARCHITECT: You are one of the 16, sir, and we would like to know--we are trying to go from point to point so that we can obligate the next stage of the work.

For instance, when we speak about the Verendorf (phonetically) truss and how it has been developed--it has not gone into the design development stage--we are 15 percent schematic at this stage of presentation. We fully realize that there is a lot more work to be done.

Now, how do we link in that problem we have in going to the next stage with what you gentlemen are commenting on?

MR. ROCHE: I think we still get back to the opening thing that it's really not possible with this material to make a judgment on what the presence of this whole complex is going to be in relation to this design.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, aren't we saying that we approve the functional relationships and all of that. We don't approve the design, if that's what that model was made for, at all.

N.B.

Is that clear?

NVC ARCHITECT: I think so.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, it couldn't be any clearer. We're saying that the function and the relationships of the departments and all of that--if you want our comment--it seems fine to us. N.B.

But we're not approving the aesthetics or the appearance or the materials. And we don't think the structural system has been exploited to the total building, not just for the garage.

NVC ARCHITECT: Yes, sir.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's what we're saying, and I don't know what that has to do with your 15 percent. That's something for you to solve.

MRS. SMITH: We had one question that we did go through about the stacking of cars on the whole entrance side.

NVC ARCHITECT: The other side?

MRS. SMITH: Yes.

NVC ARCHITECT: It represents twice what we can stack..it is simply that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Uh-huh.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's a railroad station, not an airport.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, you've got a feeling about

what we're talking about.

NVC ARCHITECT: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That's as probably as far as we can go, don't you think?

NVC ARCHITECT: Does the Commission have any feeling about the treatment of the old Birnham Building itself?

MRS. SAARINEN: That we went through the last time.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We went through that before and we liked it. It isn't up today.

MRS. SAARINEN: How unpleasant everything else was, but...

NVC ARCHITECT: Yes, I remember now that you did speak to the old building the last time, but I'm glad to know that you feel that way about it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Oh, no, we were thoroughly in approval of it. Action on Barnham Bldg

And I am sure it is going to be refined along the way.

NVC ARCHITECT: Can I just ask one further question just so you can clarify something in my mind?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

NVC ARCHITECT: I know that at the first presentation there was some concern about the relief that we were providing

to the facade; and the explanation I gave and the reason why we're doing that is that this space here is really a collection of spots for many many people going to many many places.

Now, we expressed that--let's see, the expression of that facade--is there a feeling of the Commission that an interrupted facade of this sort as we have regardless of the detail is objectionable or...

MR. ROCHE: I don't think we can answer that part of the question because you might have convinced--it's really an attempt to get around without both feet. It would just be self-defeating.

I think you have a great opportunity. This could really be a great building. And you haven't hit it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Maybe I can answer it in a half-baked way. These facs (facades?) in a certain kind of design--not this one--might look good. You know what I mean? These two facs, they interrupt it. In a certain co-related design they might look good, but in another kind they might be inappropriat

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Uh-huh.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I hope that's sufficient.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you very much. Thank you, Sutton. It's nice to see you around.

MR. SUTTON: I guess we'll go down together, huh?

(I believe in reference to setbacks or notches separating parking structure facade, emphasizing center

9 November 1970

Dear Mr. Jett:

This will confirm the Commission's action taken at its July 8th meeting on the National Visitors Center and parking facility. Plans for the remodeling of Union Station as a Visitors Center were approved. Plans for the parking facility, bus station, train station, including circulation, general massing, etc. were approved.

Specifically disapproved was the architectural treatment for the garage and station structure. The Commission feels that a building of either all-concrete or all-steel would be preferable to a mixture of the two materials as proposed. Also pointed out was the treatment of the elevations which tended to have the character of an office building and not a garage. The Commission feels that a simple expression of the function plus the use of a single material will lead to a better solution.

The next meeting of the Commission is scheduled for December 2nd and we will be happy to view any new plans at that time.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr.T. Sutton Jett
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240

Exhibit D.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS · MAY 13 1970

NO OG 70-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
117	1568-33rd Street, N. W. John H. F. Hoving	Replace exist. garage door with new.
ACTION:	No obj., 5/6/70.	
118	1659 Wisc. Ave., NW Rob't. E. Brady (Commercial)	Reside entire exterior walls. Applied horizontal.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Recom. smooth alum. siding to match character & scale of exist. bldg. Request sample of same, 5/6/70.	
120	3027 Q St., NW Kenneth B. Little	Masonry & glass enclosure for swimming pool & garage extension.
ACTION:	No obj., 5/6/70.	
121	3406 Q St., NW Dr & Mrs Ernest Sturc	Brick wall & carport.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Recom. elimination of shingle "parapet", substituting simple brick cap on top of wall. Further study also required of entr. of carport, 5/6/70.	
123	3406 R St., NW Roger Stevens	2-story brick addn.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Manner in which new addn. wraps around west & north elevations, unsuitable. Recom. restudy of addn. as smaller extension of exist. wing on west elevation. Drawings should show new work in relation to entire facades, MAY 13 1970	
125	1512-34th St., NW Mrs. Dudley Knox	Replace cast iron steps & platform with brick steps & platform. Install w. i. rails. Install post light.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Recom. retention of orig. iron stairway, which is more in keeping with exist. house. No obj. to new lamppost, 5/6/70.	

Exhibit E.

NO OG 70-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
126	2811 M St., NW Curl Gallery	One s-f, 12 sq-ft sign.
ACTION:	No obj., 5/6/70.	
127	3232-34 M St., NW Columbia Glass & Mirror	Constr. new 2-story office addn. to the rear of the original house & over exist. 1-story shop area.
ACTION:	No obj., 5/6/70.	
128	1365 Wisc. Ave., NW Urdong Bros. Corp.	Exterior alterations in accordance with attached drawings.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 5/6/70.	
129	3112 M St., NW Harry R. Lowstuter	Remove trim & stucco from front of bldg., change signs & brick-up block wall facing alley.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 5/6/70.	
130	1423-36th St., NW Elizabeth F. B. Moore	Raze dwelling for constr. of new single family residence.

ACTION: After careful study of exist. structure, its history & arch'l. character, & its adaptability to remodeling, the CFA concludes that it is reasonable to replace the exist. bldg. with one of appropriate character & scale, & therefore withdraws its prev. obj. to razing the exist. structure. (OG 70-77), 5/7/70.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

JUN 9 1970

NO OG 70-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
119	3400 Reservoir Rd., NW David H. Ward	Swimming pool. Exist. fence & vegatation to be taken down & replaced after constr.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 4/14/70.	
122	3215 R St., NW Wallace F. Holiday	Lantern at side of main entr., & lantern at side of garage entr. Light above house number.
ACTION:	No obj., 4/20/70.	
124	3237 N St., NW George T. Bell (Apts.)	Install 2 bullet-type flood fixtures on rear of bldg. to illuminate parking lot.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 5/12/70.	
131	1258 Wisc. Ave., NW The Store, Ltd.	2 vinylized canvas awnings with fixed iron frames. Over entr. & showwindow.
ACTION:	No obj., 5/28/70.	
132	3525 "O" St., NW Harry Montague	Repair exterior wood entr. porch by relocating stair & making platform smaller. See drawing. All below 1st fl.
ACTION:	No obj., 5/28/70.	
133	3406 Q St., NW Dr & Mrs Ernest Sturc	Encl. front yard with 7' high brick wall. Build carport with overhead door & remote control operation for security reasons behind garden wall.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 5/12/70.	

NO OG 70-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
134	3040 P St., NW Willis H. Shapley	Install light at front entr.
ACTION: Prefer fixture more in character with house. Eliminate fake oil reservoir, 5/28/70.		
135	1265 Wisc. Ave., NW Georgetown Jewel Gallery	Constr. masonry rear addn.
ACTION: Ret'd. without action on the basis of restricted visibility, 5/28/70.		
136	1659 Wisc. Ave., NW Lapidary Jewelers	Alum. siding over exist. frame constr.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided alum. siding match size of exist. wood siding. Also trim around doors, windows, corner boards, & eaves to be adjusted so as to have same relation to new siding as exist., 5/28/70.		
137	1680 Wisc. Ave., NW Station WMOD / WOL	2 s-f signs. 26 sq-ft area. Resubm. of prev. request. (See OG 70-95).
ACTION: Not recom'd. See action on OG 70-95, JUN 9 1970		
138	1440 Wisc. Ave., NW Melart Jewelers	Reface bulkhead under front window.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Marble facing out of character with exist. bldg. Suggest that metal panel be repainted, JUN 9 1970		
139	1440 Wisc. Ave., NW Melart Jewelers	1 canvas awning over showwindow & door, suspended from bldg. with fixed iron frames.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Recom. simple shed-type, or roll-type awning of a single color, JUN 9 1970		

NO OG 70-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
140	1209-35th St., NW Paul Hartstall	6' high stockade fence to replace exist. wood fence.
ACTION: No obj., 5/28/70.		
141	1211-35th St., NW Henrieta Towsley	6' high stockade fence to replace exist. wood fence.
ACTION: No obj., 5/28/70.		
Inf. 142	1225 Wisc. Ave., NW Burger Chef Systems	Alter showwindows & build rear addn.
ACTION: Prefer exist. showwindow, omitting muntins. Also request inf. on any mechanical equip. projecting through roof. No obj. to rear addn., 5/28/70.		
143	1048 Potomac St., NW C.W. Shoemaker, II & Wm. A. Volkman, Jr.	Resubm. of repair to fire-damaged bldg. front.
ACTION: No obj., provided that wood frames are painted dark gray, & that the bldg. is painted a light warm gray, 5/28/70.		
144	1510 Wisc. Ave., NW L. Frank & Co. (Dresses)	1 s-f, 25 sq-ft sign.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Location, size, shape, character of lettering, & design of sign, are unsuitable. Suggest a simple rectangular sign, 25 sq-ft with arch'l. lettering of a single color, centered on bldg. & mounted over doorway, JUN 9 1970		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS 5/15/70

NO SL 70-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
38	2311 Conn. Ave., NW Woodward Apts.	Openings for thru-wall air conditioning units. All units behind exist. property lines.
ACTION: App'd., 5/6/70.		
39	416 Canal St., SE Colonial Ice Cream Co.	Raze exist. bldgs. & resurface open area for parking lot.
ACTION: Disap'd. Parking to be confined to privately-owned space with either a brick wall or evergreen hedge approx. 42" high planted along the entire property line in order to screen parking. Request submission of light fixtures, signs, & attendants shed for review, 5/15/70.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS JUN 9 1970

NO SL-70	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
Inf. 40	1400-22nd St., NW Gulf Oil Co.	Raze exist. service station. Erect new service station, canopies, pavement.

ACTION: No obj. to design per se - but recom. a better development of land, with a combination of office or commercial structures, with gas station enclosed in bldg. (This was done very successfully by Esso in their offices which until recently stood on Const. Ave. & 3rd St., NW), 6/2/70.

41	2500 Va. Ave., NW Watergate East (Mrs. Coolidge)	Encl. portion of terrace fronting New Hampshire Avenue.

ACTION: Disap'd. Connecting links between buildings should be kept open as originally conceived, JUN 9 1970

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
14 October 1970

AM
10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W.

ADMINISTRATION

1. Approval of Minutes of July Meeting

2. Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday, 18 November 1970

3. Budget Estimates for Fiscal 1972, $115,000

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

   Revised Designs for the Federal Triangle, Post Office Dept., Old Post Office Tower and Great Plaza

2. Department of the Army, Chief of Engineers

   New Walter Reed Army Hospital Building - Proposed Design

3. D.C. Government, Office of General Services

   1. Benning Elementary School, 41st & East Capitol Sts., N.E.- Proposed Design

   2. Gage Eckington School, 2nd & V Sts., N.W. - Revised Design

   3. Merritt Elementary School, 49th & Hayes St., N.E. - Proposed Design

4. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

   a. Proposed Rehabilitation of Memorial Bridge Statues, Leo Friedlander, sculptor

   b. Relocation of Statue of Jose de San Martin at 20th St. and Virginia Ave., N.W.

   c. Proposed Repainting of Netherlands Carillon

5. Presidents Cabinet Committee on Education

   Proposed Seal - Confirmation of Action

6. D.C. Government, Office of Economic Development

Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 71-11, 1701 New York Ave., N.W. Office Building, Proposed Design

b. S.L. 71-10, 601 D St., N.W., Office Building - Proposed Design

c. S.L. 71- , Columbia Plaza Office Building, E and 24th Sts., N.W. - Revised Design

d. S.L. 71- , United Unions Office Building, 17th and New York Ave., N.W. - Approval of Working Drawings Required

e. Appendix 1

Old Georgetown Act

Appendix 2

LEGISLATION

H.R. 17377-Interior Report on a bill to erect a statue of Bernardo de Galvez on public grounds in the District of Columbia.

INTERVIEWS

2:00 1. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Relocation of Statue of Jose de San Martin

2. General Services Administration

Revised Designs for the Federal Triangle, Post Office Dept., Old Post Office Tower and Great Plaza

3. D.C. Government, Office of General Services

a. Benning Elementary School, 41st & East Capitol Sts., N.W. Proposed Design

b. Gage Eckington School, 2nd and V Sts., N.W. - Revised Design

c. Merritt Elementary School, 49th and Hayes St., N.E. - Proposed Design

4. D.C. Government, Office of Economic Development

Shipstead-Luce Act'

a. S.L. 71-11, 1701 New York Ave., N.W. Office Building, Proposed Design

b. S.L. 71-10, 601 D St., N.W., Office Building - Proposed Design

c. S.L. 71- , Columbia Plaza Office Building, E and 24th Sts., N. Revised Design

d. S.L. 71- , United Unions Office Building, 17th and New York Avenue, N.W. - Approval of Working Drawings Required.

5. Department of the Army, Chief of Engineers

New Walter Reed Army Hospital Building - Proposed Design

1970-07-08
Jun 23, 2017